

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-22 and 24-26 remain in the present application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21 and 24-26

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0156929 by Hekmatpour (hereafter referred to as “Hekmatpour”) in view of United States Patent Number 6,588,004 to Southgate et al. (hereafter referred to as “Southgate”). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Southgate for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites method of generating a project datasheet in an integrated design environment comprising (emphasis added):

accessing project data from an XML database structure, said project data from the integrated design environment and for describing an electronic system design for implementation on a programmable system on a chip processor, wherein said project data comprises specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor;
accessing an XSL stylesheet directed to project datasheets; and
processing said project data according to said XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file, wherein said project datasheet file comprises said specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor.

Independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-23 and 25-26 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Page 4 of the rejection states that Hekmatpour fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said project datasheet file comprises said specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor” as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicants concur.

Applicants respectfully submit that Southgate, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said project datasheet file comprises said specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, a project datasheet file comprises specified pinout connection data for a programmable system on a chip processor.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Southgate to teach a graphic editor for creating an integrated circuit *without* specified pinout connection data. For example, as shown in Figure 1 of Southgate, the overall block diagram of the integrated circuit does not reference pins (e.g., pin numbers, etc.) of the integrated circuit. Further, as acknowledged by page 4 of the rejection, Southgate is directed to a graphical editor “including inputs and outputs for each gate *within*” an integrated circuit as opposed to *pinout* connection data of an integrated circuit as claimed. Moreover, Southgate teaches the use of generalized conduits which represent multiple signals (Figure 1; col. 4, lines 34-35; col. 7, lines 3-6), e.g., A[7...0], B[7...0], etc., instead of

more specific pin-level data as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Southgate teaches away from the claimed embodiments.

Further, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Southgate of specified pinout connection data *for a programmable system on a chip* as recited in independent Claim 1. Although page 4 of the rejection states that Southgate discloses an “integrated circuit design including inputs and outputs for each gate within a system on a chip,” Applicants fail to find such a teaching or suggestion in Southgate. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Southgate fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said project datasheet file comprises said specified pinout connection data *for said programmable system on a chip processor*” as recited in independent Claim 1.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Southgate, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 recite limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 4-5, 8-9, 13-14, 16, 20-21 and 25-26 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 4-5, 8-9, 13-14, 16, 20-21 and 25-26 are also not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Southgate. Therefore, Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are allowable.

Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22

Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hekmatpour in view of Southgate, and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,748,569 to Brooke (hereafter referred to as "Brooke"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Southgate and further in view of Brooke for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Brooke, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour and/or Southgate, fails to cure the deficiencies of the Hekmatpour/Southgate combination discussed above with respect to independent Claims 1, 11, 17 and 24. Specifically, Brooke fails to teach or suggest the limitations "wherein said project datasheet file comprises said specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor" as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, since Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Southgate and further in view of Brooke. Thus, Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record, and are therefore allowable.

Claim 10

Claim 10 is rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hekmatpour in view of Southgate, and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,704,893 to Bauwens (hereafter referred to as

"Bauwens"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 10 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Southgate and further in view of Bauwens for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bauwens, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour and/or Southgate, fails to cure the deficiencies of the Hekmatpour/Southgate combination discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Bauwens fails to teach or suggest the limitations "wherein said project data comprises specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor" as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, since Claim 10 recites further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1, Claim 10 is not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Southgate and further in view of Bauwens. Thus, Claim 10 overcomes the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record, and is therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-6, 8-22 and 24-26 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 8/15, 2007

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060